



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

changing, growing menace? Sibert? Why not any other brigadier-general among the host of officers of an army of 2,000,000 men?

Why should these boys, suddenly translated into *men*, be expected to be reading within the first six weeks after the operation anything but their lessons and their required books?

But now that the writer has made his test what is he going to do? Will he build on the favorite poets already loved and connect their immortal beauty and their lofty idealism more closely to the daily lives of my boys? If so, God bless him! Will he drag my American boys, who love Riley and Longfellow, through the materialism of Sudermann and Hauptmann? If so, God forbid! Now that these boy-men are approaching more nearly the time of active participation in business and the affairs of citizenship, will he use their liking for Dickens, Harold Bell Wright, and Scott, and the *Literary Digest* and *Saturday Evening Post* to strengthen their perception of and grasp of the high ethical principles so necessary for genuine success in the fields of business and citizenship? If so, God speed!

But let him look out, for the kind of investigation he has undertaken may very easily prove the equation "pep minus purpose equals piffle."

A HIGH-SCHOOL TEACHER

THE EXAMINER'S CATECHISM

B. PHILOSOPHY OF EXAMINING

Are there irreconcilable differences between examinations given as external tests to satisfy interested authority and examinations given as means of growth and development?

Is it consistent with modern educational philosophy to continue traditional systems of examinations, as commonly employed as a basis of promotions, in which pupils feel that they must pass set examinations at stated times or fail to maintain their places in the school?

What philosophical considerations seem to determine the purposes of examinations?

What are the most prominent motives that appeal to pupils who do their studying primarily with reference to final examinations?

What are some of the evil results of emphasis upon examinations as an incentive to study?

Within what limits is it true that under present systems of examining, teachers cannot get at the things most highly prized educationally—e.g., the effect of teaching upon the development of social attitudes or upon the establishment of specific habits?

Should examinations be made educative in the sense that they enable the student to test his own powers?

What can be done in giving examinations to interest pupils more in beating their own records than in beating the records of others?

In what sense may examinations afford satisfaction to the thoughtful student who finds therein opportunity for new combinations of ideas?

Should examinations be made educational in the sense that they make the student conscious of the growing process? To what extent may they serve as opportunities for encouragement and enthusiasm?

Which is the more valid test, that of information or that of appreciation, in examinations on literature?

What are the most important moral effects, either good or bad, resulting from the traditional method of examining such as is commonly used as a basis for promotion in public schools and as a requirement for college entrance?

FOR THE POETRY STUDENT OF 2219

The seminar of the literature department of some university is going to spend fruitful hours of delightful study in the year 2219 over the all-absorbing topic of the origin of the free-verse and similar movements which ruffled, even if they did not change, the current of poetic development in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Even as we have quarried in the private papers and correspondence of Elizabethans to puzzle-piece together the attempts of Gabriel Harvey and Sir Phillip Sidney to force classic quantitative measures upon English poetry, and as we spend days and time discussing what the lost poems of Spenser were about rather than reading the extant ones and appreciating them, so will graduate students of the later centuries dig up the files of our present-day periodicals to learn, if possible, who started it all.

So far it has been proved satisfactorily, I believe, that the translators of the Bible, and Shakespeare, Carlyle, Meredith, Hunt, Ruskin, and Conrad all knew the secret of cadence and therefore were innocently guilty of free verse, not having courage, or cleverness, or eccentricity, to print it as such. One wonders whether it might not be proven that every writer of great prose has produced passages as beautiful and forceful as those of any strenuous "wrighter" of a modern ejaculation.

With delight such as that which surges over the discoverer of a banal college essay by Thoreau, or the candidate for the doctorate who chances to read upon an unrecorded early simile later dubbed Petrarchan, I chanced upon the possible though all-unknowing inventors of modern verse freedom, for there were two.